

CAESAR IN BRITAIN

C. IULI CAESARIS DE BELLO
GALLICO COMMENTARII
QUARTUS (xx-xxxviii) ET QUINTUS

EDITED BY

T. RICE HOLMES, HON. LITT.D. (DUBLIN)

WITH A VOCABULARY COMPILED BY

GEORGE G. LOANE, M.A.

A MASTER AT ST. PAUL'S SCHOOL

OXFORD

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON EDINBURGH GLASGOW NEW YORK

TORONTO MELBOURNE AND BOMBAY

HUMPHREY MILFORD

1916

56/11/15
61

110
D97

A 455170

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

- Caesar's Conquest of Gaul.* Second edition revised throughout and largely rewritten. 1911. 8vo, pp. xl + 872, with a map and 8 plans. 24s. net.
- Ancient Britain and the Invasions of Julius Caesar.* 1907. 8vo, pp. xvi + 764, with 3 maps and 44 illustrations. 21s. net.
- Caesar: De Bello Gallico I-VII (with Hirtius, Comm. VIII).* 1914. 8vo, pp. xlvi + 462, with 11 maps and 9 plans. 8s. 6d. net.
- Caesar: The Gallic War.* 1914. Crown 8vo. Seven volumes. 2s. each volume. New Clarendon Press Series (under the General Editorship of the Rev. A. E. Hillard, Head Master of St. Paul's School).

59

11/15

COMMENTARIUS V

NOTES

1, § 1. *L. Domitio . . . consulibus.* The consuls entered upon office on January 1, 700 (54 B. C.): therefore Caesar was unusually late in leaving the winter quarters of his army, though it must not be forgotten that the calendar was then in advance of the real time.

ut quotannis . . . consuemat. Caesar used to go to Italy for the winter, partly in order to act as a judge and to transact other civil business in Cisalpine Gaul, partly to keep in touch with Italian politics and to look after his own interests.

legatis. *Legati*, in the sense in which the word is used here, were generally, if not always, senators, and were as a rule appointed by the senate (Cicero, *Fam.*, i, 7, § 10); but Caesar, perhaps without consulting that assembly, could appoint *legati* himself (Cicero, *Att.*, ii, 18, § 3; *Q. fr.*, ii, 10 [12], §§ 4-5). *Legati* were expected to perform any duty with which their chief might entrust them. On Monday a *legatus* might be placed in command of a legion and lead it in battle (*B. G.*, i, 51, § 1; ii, 20, § 3, &c.); on Tuesday he might be sent to raise a fresh levy of troops (vi, 1, § 1). Several passages (i, 52, § 1; ii, 26, § 1; v, 1, § 1; 25, § 5; vii, 45, § 7) prove that in Caesar's time any *legatus* who commanded a legion was specially appointed to his command by Caesar and held it only so long as Caesar pleased. The office of *legatus* was passing through a transitional stage and gradually tending to crystallize into the form which it assumed under the empire, when the *legatus* became a *legatus legionis* (*C. G.*, pp. 563-4).

§ 2. *propter crebras . . . feri.* This is not the true explanation. The comparative smallness of the waves in the Channel is due to the shallowness of the water and its contraction within narrow limits.

in reliquis . . . maribus,—in the various arms of the Mediterranean, which had their several names, *Hadriaticum mare*, *sinus Ligusticus*, &c.

§ 3. *actuariae naues*, as one might infer from the words *quam . . . adiuvat*, were constructed both for rowing and sailing.

imperat fieri. Caesar only uses *impero* with the infinitive in the case of passive and deponent verbs, except in one instance (*B. C.*, iii, 42, § 2), where an active and a passive are associated, —*Eo partem navium longarum convenire, frumentum . . . comportari imperat*; and in this case, as Meusel remarks in a note on the passage, he would probably have written *iubet* if he had remembered that *convenire* preceded.

§ 4. *Ea . . . iubet.* The esparto grass of Spain was in great demand for making ropes. The iron and copper required for

anchors and other purposes were, I suppose, fetched from the mines of Gaul. Cf. iii, 21, § 3; iv, 31, § 2; vii, 22, § 2.

§ 5. *conventibus*. The word *conventus* is used by Caesar in the sense of an assembly or meeting (i, 18, § 2) of the community of Roman citizens living in a provincial town (*B. C.*, iii, 29, § 1, &c.), and, as in this passage, of judicial or administrative business performed by himself, as Governor, in an assembly of Roman citizens or provincials. As he went on circuit, like a judge, through Cisalpine Gaul and Illyricum to discharge these duties, we may translate *conventibus . . . peractis* by 'After finishing the assizes in Cisalpine Gaul'.

Illyricum extended east of the Adriatic, as far southward as Epirus and Macedonia and eastward as far as Moesia.

§ 6. *cum venisset*. As Mr. W. E. P. Pantin explains in his lucid chapter on 'The Conjunction *Cum*' (*Macmillan's Latin Course: Third Part*, p. 60), '*Cum* with a subjunctive puts before us the circumstances in which the action represented by the principal verb takes place', whereas *cum* with the indicative tells us 'only how one action is related to another with regard to the time of its occurrence'.

§ 7. *legatos*. The reader will notice in the course of the narrative that Caesar uses the word *legatus* in two senses, which can always be easily distinguished. Sometimes, as in i, § 1, the word denotes one (or more) of the generals who served under him; sometimes, as in the present instance, it means an envoy or ambassador.

satis facere. Caesar often uses *paratus* with an infinitive, but, as in 5, § 2, &c., he also uses it with *ad* and the gerundive.

§ 8. *ceriam*. *Dies* in the singular is often feminine when it means a fixed day, and almost always when, as in i, 7, § 6, it means a period of time.

§ 9. *litem*,—'the matters in dispute' [between the several tribes].

2, § 2. *cuius* is explained by what grammarians call an ellipsis. Caesar meant *cuius generis naves*.

longas. 'Long ships', or galleys, were of various kinds: everybody is familiar with the terms 'bireme', 'trireme', &c. What class these particular *naves longae* belonged to we are not told: but Caesar's narrative (iv, 25, § 1) shows that they were shallow; and I doubt whether any of them had more than one bank of oars (see M. le Contre-Amiral Serre, *Les marines de guerre de l'antiquité*, 1885, p. 36). *Naves longae* were not always even decked (*B. C.*, i, 56, § 1; iii, 7, § 2).

neque multum abesse . . . possint—'and that it was not far from the possibility of their being launched in a few days'—means in plain English 'and [that they] would be ready for launching in a few days'. After *ab eo* one might expect *ut*; but *ab eo* does not affect the construction, the negative requiring *quin*. If any one will ponder the passage, he will see that the

thought is rather loosely expressed. Caesar would perhaps have made his meaning clearer—to a beginner—if he had either omitted *paucis diebus* or written (as in iii, 18, § 4) *neque longius abesse quin paucis diebus*, &c.

§ 4. *expeditis*. When this word is used of troops it does not always mean the same thing. When troops who were just going into action are called *expediti* (vii, 11, § 8; 40, § 1; *B. C.*, iii, 85, § 4, &c.) we are to understand that they were free from every burden that would have interfered with their fighting,—in other words, that they were not carrying their packs (*sarcinae*). But these four legions were starting on a march which would last several days, and therefore could not do without their packs or even a certain amount of baggage. *Expeditis* therefore means that they took no more baggage than was absolutely necessary: it may be translated by 'in light marching order'.

equitibus. In the Gallic war Caesar's cavalry consisted entirely of foreigners,—Gauls, Spaniards, and in the last two campaigns (52 and 51 B. C.) if not before, Germans. They were often commanded by their national chiefs (viii, 12, § 4). See *C. G.*, pp. 579-81.

quod hi . . . parebant. Three years before, the Treveri had sent a body of cavalry to assist Caesar in his campaign against the Belgae; but they had deserted in the battle with the Nervii, and, as Caesar says (ii, 24, § 5), 'told their countrymen that the Romans were disastrously defeated.' Unless he recalled them to obedience, it was probable that while he was in Britain Gauls and Germans would raise a rebellion in his rear.

concilia. In the spring of every year Caesar convened a diet of the Gallic chieftains, partly perhaps to test their temper, partly to fix the strength of the cavalry contingents which their respective tribes were to provide. Cf. iv, 6, § 5; v, 24, § 1; vi, 3, § 4.

Transrhenanos is added in order to show that the Belgic tribes—the Condrusi, Eburones, Caerosi, Paemani, and Segni—whom Caesar called Germans (ii, 4, § 10; vi, 32, § 1), are not meant.

3, § 1. *totius Galliae* is equivalent to *totius Galliae civitatum*.

§ 2. *principatu*. It is doubtful whether in this passage *principatus* means, as in vi, 8, § 9, 'the chief magistracy' or simply unofficial supremacy.

§ 4. *Arduennam*. Our 'Forest of Arden' in Warwickshire shows another form of the word.

§ 5. *principes* seems to mean simply 'leading men'; it does not, as for instance in vii, 65, § 2 and 88, § 4, denote magistrates. Some of the *principes*, whom Caesar frequently mentions, were certainly magistrates, and perhaps these were; but the word, as such, rarely bears that meaning.

quoniam here takes the subjunctive because Caesar is not

stating the reason merely as his own, but as present in the minds of the conspirators.

§ 7. *fidei* here has the sense of *tutela*.

4, § 3. *cuius . . . perspexisset*. The subjunctive is not due merely to the Oratio Obliqua: it is used because the clause gives the reason for Caesar's having wished to do honour to Cingetorix.

§ 4. *factum* is a substantive.

suam . . . minui. If, as I believe, these words are genuine, they explain and are in apposition with *Id*; but Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, pp. 36-7) brackets them.

qui . . . fuisset. Again the subjunctive is used because a reason is implied:—'whereas he had already been', &c.

5, § 1. *Caesar . . . pervenit*. Caesar left Blandeno in Cisalpine Gaul about the 30th of April (of the Julian calendar) and, after the movements described in ch. 2-4, arrived at Portus Itius about the 11th of June. He had therefore posted across Gaul at the rate of 50 miles a day or more; and there is no more conclusive proof of the hold which he had already obtained upon the Gallic tribes than the fact that he was able to count, as securely as in Italy, upon finding horses ready for each successive stage (*A. B.*, pp. 329, 727).

§ 2. *factae erant . . . erant profectae*. The first *erant* is intelligible enough, for the clause *quae . . . erant* is not part of the Oratio Obliqua. The second is explained by grammarians in the same way; but to my mind the explanation is, by itself, hardly sufficient, for *unde erant profectae* seems at first sight inseparable from *eodem*, which is part of the Oratio Obliqua. Probably Caesar, having written *eodem*, added *unde erant profectae* (which is not dependent upon *cognoscit*) to make his meaning clear.

§ 3. *principes*. See the first note on 3, § 5.

6, § 1. *Dumnorix* (see p. 4) had been detected four years before in intriguing against the Romans; and Caesar had placed him under close observation.

§ 2. *quod* is here, as often, used in the sense of 'the fact that'; but this ugly expression should always be avoided if possible. One might translate *Accedebat . . . dixerat* by 'Moreover, Dumnorix had stated', &c.

dixerat . . . deferri. Various writers have suggested that Caesar really had made this offer to Dumnorix, in order to purchase his support. It seems to me more likely that Dumnorix had made the statement in order to exasperate the Aedui against Caesar. Still, Caesar may have thrown out some vague hint which led him to expect that if he proved himself loyal he would be rewarded.

neque is evidently equivalent to *neque tamen*,—'but not'.

hospitibus. By the Roman institution called *hospitium privatum* agreements were concluded between individual Roman

citizens and individual foreigners, under which the former were entitled to receive hospitality from the latter. It has been remarked that this practice must have been very useful in places where the accommodation of inns was not available. Provincials upon whom the members of a governor's staff were billeted were also called *hospites* (Cicero, *Att.*, v, 10, § 2).

§ 3. *quod insuetus . . . timeret*. The subjunctive is used because the clause is not a statement of fact made by Caesar, but gives the gist of Dumnorix's plea. The explanation of *diceret*, as the reader will understand, if he thinks, is different. The subjunctive is here, strictly speaking, illogical: the verb is, as it were, attracted into the subjunctive from that verb to which the subjunctive properly belongs: in other words, *partim quod . . . diceret* is equivalent to *partim quod, ut dicebat, religionibus impeditur*.

religionibus means 'religious obligations'.

§ 5. *nobilitate*, as we may infer from vi, 13, §§ 1-3, does not mean 'the nobility' or 'the nobles', but simply 'men of rank': in other words, it does not denote a definite class, like our peerage, but merely the most prominent members of the class which Caesar (vi, 13, § 3) calls *equites*, or knights. For in vi, 13, immediately after saying that in Gaul there were only two classes which were held in any esteem, and immediately before saying that 'one of the two classes consists of the Druids, the other of the Knights', he makes this remark:—'Generally, when crushed by debt or heavy taxation or ill-treated by powerful individuals, they [the common people] bind themselves to serve *men of rank* (*plerique cum aut aere alieno aut magnitudine tributorum aut iniuria potentiorum premuntur, sese in servitute dicant nobilibus*). If the *nobiles* had formed a definite class, superior to the *equites*, Caesar would have said that there were only *three* classes which were held in any esteem.

§ 6. *fidem*. Not *suam*, which Caesar would have expressed, as in 36, § 2, but *reliquorum*: he 'interposed their pledged word' as a bar to their leaving Gaul; in other words, he made them promise to stay. Doberenz-Dinter are surely wrong in taking *reliquis* as meaning all except Dumnorix himself, that is to say, all those with whom he had intrigued: it is opposed to *principes* (§ 4).

7, § 2. *longius . . . videbat*. The force of the comparative may be expressed by this translation,—'his frenzy was evidently passing all bounds'.

§ 3. *commoratus* is not exactly equivalent to the present participle. As Madvig says (*Lat. Gr.*, § 431. b), the past participle of deponents is often used 'to indicate the motive, occasion [as here], or manner of the main action'.—'For about twenty-five days . . . he was kept waiting. . . Accordingly he did his best to keep Dumnorix steady,' &c.

Corus ventus may be translated by 'the north-west wind';

but as the ancients had no compasses, they could not tell with mathematical precision the point from which the wind was blowing. In Caesar's time the circle from any point of which the wind may blow was divided into twelve equal parts; and accordingly the wind called *Corus* may have blown from any quarter between NW. and W. by N. $\frac{1}{3}$ N. (*A. B.*, p. 555, n. 2).

§ 5. *cum equitibus Haeduorum*. In 58 B. C. Dumnorix had commanded the Aeduan cavalry which served under Caesar; and apparently he did so still. Why Caesar accepted or employed as commander of this allied force a man whom he so thoroughly distrusted, we do not know; probably he was unwilling to provoke him to open opposition until he felt able to get rid of him.

6. *retrahi*. See the note on I, § 3 (*imperat fieri*).

7. *neglexisset*. See the note on 4, § 3.

8. *enim*. Not without hesitation I retain the MS. reading instead of *autem*, which occurs in an inferior MS. and in the first printed edition of the *Commentaries*. In several passages some MSS. have *autem*, others *enim*. Some editors explain *enim* by an ellipsis; and the following translation of *nihil . . . resistere* will show what they mean:—'for he thought that a man who disregarded his authority when he was present would not behave rationally in his absence. [And he was right in so thinking;] for when called upon to return he resisted', &c. Sometimes, however, as Schneider points out, *enim* means much the same as *scilicet*, and so here it would be equivalent to 'as might have been expected' (from what has been said before about his character). But connecting particles are often used in Greek and Latin when a good English writer would use none; and the best way of translating *enim* (or *autem*) here would be to ignore it.

§ 9. *hominem*. The word here shows animosity, while in 58, § 6, as we shall see, *hominis* implies admiration. *Circumstant hominem* might be translated by 'surrounded the fellow'.

8, § 1. Labienus was the ablest of Caesar's generals and also the highest in rank. As *legatus pro praetore* (i, 21, § 2), he was Acting Governor of Gaul and Commander-in-Chief in the winter, when Caesar was generally in Italy. See v, 1, § 1.

portus. The plural shows that in 54, as in 55 B. C. (iv, 22, § 4), Caesar found it convenient to keep more than one harbour under control.

§ 2. *naves solvit* means 'loosed the ships' (from their fastenings) and generally connotes the operation of letting go a hawser and putting off from shore or quay.

Africo must be translated by 'south-west wind', and is so called because it was the most favourable wind for ships sailing from Carthage to Sicily. It may have blown from any point between SW. and W. by S. $\frac{1}{3}$ S. See the second note on 7, § 3.

aestu. Caesar was carried out of his course (*delatus*) by the

flood tide, the general direction of which was ENE. On the night of the 6th of July (of the Julian calendar)—the date on which, as we may infer from Cicero's correspondence, Caesar most probably sailed (*A. B.*, pp. 728-30)—the stream began to run up the Channel about ten o'clock; for it turned westward again (§ 3) soon after daybreak (*A. B.*, p. 658).

sub sinistra . . . conspexit. As Caesar was drifting towards the North Sea, he saw the white cliffs of East Kent (see the first note on 9, § 1) receding on the port quarter (*sub sinistra*).

§ 3. *aestus . . . contendit.* The Romans had a system of naval signalling, and either by this means or by oral instructions conveyed from vessel to vessel the order was given to go about and run down with the stream. If the ebb tide had served throughout, it would not have been necessary to row hard in order that the whole fleet should reach Britain before noon. In *A. B.*, pp. 655-9, I have shown that so long as it was possible to follow the tide, the work of the rowers was easy, but that when, probably not far from the spot where the South Sand Head Light Vessel is moored, the ships' heads were turned in the direction of Sandwich, they encountered a cross-current setting towards the south-west.

ut . . . cognoverat does not necessarily mean that Caesar intended to land at exactly the same place at which he had landed in the preceding year. See the first note on 9, § 1.

§ 4. *vectoriis . . . navigiis.* I do not know whether Kraner is right in taking these ablatives as absolute. Their sense is concessive; but are they not also instrumental?

adaequaverint. See the note on 4, § 3.

§ 6. *cum* is used here in the sense which grammarians call 'concessive'. Any one who reads the sentence carefully will understand why they have chosen this word. But instead of translating *cum* by 'though', which would here be clumsy, it would be better to bring out the meaning of the long Latin sentence (§§ 5-6) in this way:—'The ships all reached Britain about midday, but no enemy was visible: large numbers, as Caesar found out afterwards from prisoners, had assembled at the spot, but, alarmed,' &c.

privatisque . . . fecerat. These vessels presumably belonged to merchants who had dealings with the troops or to adventurers who had been attracted by delusive stories about the wealth of Britain.

DCCC is nominative: *amplius*, with which Caesar invariably omits *quam*, does not affect the case.

superiora loca,—the high ground near Canterbury, north of the Great Stour. See the note on *Illi equitatu . . . munitum* (9, §§ 3-4).

9, § 1. *loco . . . capto.* It has been shown in the note on iv, 23, § 6 that Caesar landed in 55 B.C. between Walmer and Deal. He unquestionably landed in the same 'part of the

island' (v, 8, § 3)—that is to say, in East Kent—in 54; for it is incredible that he should have landed in 55 on one side, and in 54 on the other side of the South Foreland; and before his fleet hove in sight in 54 the Britons assembled in great force to oppose his landing (8, § 6), which shows that they felt sure that he would attempt to land at or near the place where he had landed the year before (*A. B.*, pp. 603-4). But most probably the place was not exactly the same. As we shall presently see (§§ 2-3), on the morning after the disembarkation Caesar fought an action on the banks of the Great Stour about 12 miles from his camp, and the camp must therefore have been in the neighbourhood of Sandwich. Moreover, Caesar tells us (§ 1) that when he quitted the camp he felt little anxiety for his ships, as he was leaving them at anchor on a nice open shore; and, although no other commentator has noticed the fact, any one can see that he was here excusing himself for not having hauled his ships ashore, notwithstanding the severe lesson which the storm of the previous year had given him (iv, 29), by the plea that he had selected a more favourable anchorage. The anchorage in the Small Downs is much more secure than in the Downs (*A. B.*, pp. 664-5).

cohortibus X were equivalent to one legion; but as Caesar does not say *una legione*, we may infer that the cohorts were selected from the five legions.

de tertia vigilia is generally explained as meaning 'in the third watch', though Caesar sometimes writes *tertia vigilia*, &c. without *de*. I am not quite sure that *de* does not mean 'just after' (the beginning of the third watch). For military purposes the Romans divided the period between sunset and sunrise into four watches of equal length, the third of which began at midnight.

litore . . . aperto means 'a nice open shore'. *Mollis* denotes a shore where the anchorage was good, and where the ships, if they were driven aground, would suffer comparatively little. I do not think that Schneider is right in arguing that *mollis* should be translated by 'gently sloping', though that meaning is doubtless implied. Professor J. P. Postgate, who agrees with me, has kindly referred me to a passage in Ovid (*Ep. ex Ponto*, i, 2, 61-2)—

Cum subit Augusti quae sit clementia, credo

Mollia naufragiis litora posse dari—

which seems to justify my explanation. Professor Postgate remarks that while *aperto* describes the approach to the shore, which was not blocked by rocks, *mollis* connotes both a gentle slope and a soft surface (*A. B.*, pp. 628-30). Caesar, in his anxiety to march against the Britons, took the risk of not hauling his ships up on shore, an operation which would have consumed valuable time. See the note on *loco . . . capto*. But he made a mistake, which cost him dear. See ch. 10-11.

§ 3. *essedis*. Remains of war-chariots have been found in British graves, principally in Yorkshire, but not nearly so many as in France. Yet the Gauls had evidently ceased to use them before the time of Caesar; for he never mentions them in describing his Gallic campaigns. Professor Ridgeway has suggested that the Gauls, who spent much money in buying well-bred horses (iv, 2, § 2), discarded chariots for cavalry when they began to import animals powerful enough to carry big men and to charge with effect. British horses, as we know from the skeletons that have been unearthed, were for the most part no bigger than ponies. It is a popular delusion that the British chariots had scythes (*A. B.*, pp. 342-3, 674-6).

§§ 3-4. *Illi equitatu . . . munitum*. As Caesar landed between Walmer and Sandwich, the river behind which the Britons were posted must have been either the Great Stour or the Little Stour. The Little Stour above Bokesbourne is now generally dry; but after prolonged heavy rains there may be plenty of water. In May, 1902, I walked along the bank, and there was not a teaspoonful in the channel: in April, 1904, the stream was running strongly past Barham. It may therefore have been a *flumen* in 5½ B. C., though we must not forget that both in 55 and 54 the summer, at all events in Gaul, was exceptionally dry (iv, 38, § 2; v, 24, § 1). Nevertheless Caesar did not encounter the Britons on the Little Stour. The *locus superior* which he mentions was either the left bank of the stream or high ground near the left bank. Now even at Bokesbourne the dry channel of the Little Stour is only about two feet deep; and although there are well-defined heights on the left bank between Barham and Bridge, the lowest slopes, except opposite Kingston and for a short space on either side of it, are at a considerable distance from the channel. If Caesar had crossed (as Colonel Stoffel believed) at or near Kingston, the Britons could have opposed him more effectually when he was ascending Barham Downs than by attempting to defend the passage of the rivulet. And since he would in any case be obliged to cross the Great Stour, is it not obvious that they would have waited for him behind the river, which might fairly be called an obstacle, rather than on the banks of the streamlet, which an active lad could have jumped? If, as I believe, he marched along the line of the Roman road from Sandwich to Canterbury, he crossed the Little Stour at Littlebourne, where it is wider: but Littlebourne is barely 9 miles from Sandwich; and Caesar had marched about 12 Roman miles when he first saw the British troops. Deal is about this distance from Littlebourne; but in the note on § 1 I have given reasons for believing that Caesar had encamped some miles north of Deal; and on the left bank of the Little Stour near Littlebourne there is no trace of a British camp.

The Great Stour, below Fordwich, would have been impassable

in Caesar's time in the face of an enemy; for it flowed through a broad morass. It appears to me that he must have crossed it either between Fordwich and Sturry, or in the neighbourhood of Thanington, just above Canterbury, or possibly at Canterbury itself; and I am sure that any one who will carefully examine the ground will agree with me. The stronghold to which the Britons retreated was probably a camp in Bigbury woods, about a mile and a half west of Canterbury, of which traces still exist; and it therefore seems most likely that Caesar forced the passage of the river between Canterbury and Thanington (*A. B.*, pp. 335-7, 678-85).

§ 6. *propugnabant*, coupled with *ex silvis*, implies that the scattered groups fought by throwing missiles.

prohibebant, as the context shows, means 'tried to prevent'.

§ 7. *testudine facta*. In this formation the men in the front rank held their shields before their bodies, while those behind bore theirs closely locked above their heads. Why the formation was called a *testudo* is self-evident.

aggere may here be translated by 'lumber': it does not mean 'an *agger*', or terrace. The word primarily means material—earth or what not—piled up in order to form a rampart, an embankment, or some other military structure, or (as in this passage) shot into a ditch with the object of filling it up. Caesar uses the word in various kindred senses, which can always be distinguished, without a dictionary, by a little thought. Probably the work of piling the lumber was performed by men who advanced between the files under the protection of their comrades' uplifted shields (*A. B.*, p. 337).

§ 8. *eos* is governed by *restitit*, not by *prosequi*.

10, § 1. *in expeditionem misit* does not mean 'sent on an expedition'. As Schneider says, we may infer from viii, 8, § 3 that *expeditio* is equivalent to *iter a militibus expeditis suscipiendum*. The words might be translated by 'sent a light force'.

§ 2. *cum iam . . . prospectu*. Meusel, like Schneider, explains these words as meaning 'when the rear of the enemy was just in sight'. But Caesar was not present with any of the three Roman columns: therefore, if Meusel's explanation is right, he must have ascertained afterwards that the rear of the fugitives was just visible to his troops at the very moment when he himself, separated from the troops, received the news of the shipwreck. This seems to me impossible. Meusel, however, insists that his explanation is proved by the word *iam*, and that if Caesar had meant that the rearguard of his own troops was in sight, he would have written, not *iam* but *tantum* (only) or *etiam tum*. Mr. A. G. Peskett (*C. R.*, 1908, p. 94), who agrees with me, remarks that 'the omission in Latin of the (to us) necessary qualifying word "only" is easily defensible'. If this explanation is inadmissible, I can only suppose that Caesar wrote *tantum*, not *iam* (*A. B.*, pp. 686-7; *J. B.*, 1911, p. 100).

gubernatores. Nowadays seamen take turns in steering a ship on the prescribed course; but when there were no compasses steering was necessarily entrusted to specialists. The *gubernator*, who might be loosely compared to the master in a ship of Nelson's time, had to observe sun, moon, and stars in order to know where he was, fixed the course of the ship, steered her or directed the steersman, and also performed on occasion the duties of a pilot.

11, § 1. *aigue . . . resistere*. Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, pp. 50-1; 1911, p. 100), remarking that *in itinere resistere* can only mean 'to defend themselves as they marched', argues that if Caesar had meant this, he would have added some such phrase as *si ab hostibus impetus fieret*, and that, as the enemy were in full retreat, no attack was to be feared. I have no doubt that the enemy would have regarded the recall of the legions as a sign of fear; but I agree with Meusel that the passage is suspicious. See *A. B.*, pp. 687-8.

§ 2. *reliquae . . . viderentur*. I am inclined to believe that Meusel is right in conjecturing that Caesar wrote *reliquae refecti posse, magno tamen negotio viderentur*. If the MS. reading is right, *tamen* is used in what is called a concessive sense, and means 'at any rate' or 'at least'.

§ 3. *fabros*. See *C. G.*, p. 579.

§ 4. *naves instituat*. These ships were undoubtedly built in the dockyards at Gesoriacum (Boulogne); for there could have been no appliances for ship-building at Wissant. But this is not enough to prove that Labienus's camp was at Boulogne, though most probably it was (*A. B.*, p. 584; *C. G.*, p. 434).

§ 6. Schneider apparently takes *ad* as equivalent to *quod attinet ad* ('as regards'): I believe with Meusel (*L. C.*, i, 138) that its force is final, and that the literal meaning is 'not even the hours of night being left out with a view to'—that is, 'which could be devoted to'—(the work). We should say 'the troops not suspending work even in the night'.

§ 7. *Subductis navibus*. The ships were doubtless hauled up in the usual way,—by capstans over greased logs, which the Romans called *phalangae*.

§ 8. *cuius fines . . . LXXX*. Caesar means, I suppose, that the distance from the place where he landed to the eastern frontier of Cassivellaunus's kingdom was about 80 miles. Meusel argues that Caesar could not have written these words: but in fact he only brackets *a mari . . . LXXX*; and his argument leaves me unconvinced. He urges that the passage could only make sense if the Thames had flowed from north to south instead of from west to east, for it did not really separate the territories of Cassivellaunus from those of the maritime tribes, namely, the tribes of the south-east. Moreover, he argues, a later statement (18, § 1)—*Caesar . . . ad flumen Tamesim in fines Cassivellauni exercitum ducit*—proves that the Thames

flowed *through* the territories of Cassivellaunus, and therefore did not separate them from those of the maritime tribes. Surely the passage means 'Caesar led his army to the Thames, into the territory of Cassivellaunus',—i. e. to the Thames, after crossing which he would find himself in the territory of Cassivellaunus. Caesar knew nothing about the upper Thames; but any one who looks at the map and notices the sharp north-eastward bend which the river makes from Weybridge to London will see that he might very well have said that it separated the territory of Cassivellaunus from the maritime tribes. Klotz (*C. S.*, p. 49, n. 5) acutely remarks that if we follow Meusel in bracketing this passage, we must suppose that Caesar mentioned Cassivellaunus, the most important of the British chieftains, without saying one word to indicate where his kingdom was, although he did so in the cases of the minor chiefs (22, § 1).

§ 9. *toti bello imperioque*. Cf. § 8. This expression seems to imply that the *imperium* included the general direction of the campaign and might be used in concluding alliances, making peace, &c.

12-14. Oddly enough Meusel does not bracket these chapters in his latest edition (1908), though both he (*J. B.*, 1910, pp. 29-31) and Klotz (*C. S.*, pp. 43-50) give reasons for doing so. Meusel points out that neither Pliny (*Nat. Hist.*, iv, 16, § 102) nor Tacitus (*Agricola*, 10) mentions Caesar among the writers whom they quote in their descriptions of Britain; and he objects, further, that *Belgium* (12, § 2) means the whole territory of the *Belgae*, whereas in the passages (24, § 2; 25, § 4) in which the word is used by Caesar it means only a part of their territory, and that in 14, § 1 *his* is meaningless. This last remark seems to me hypercritical; and does not Caesar use the words *Gallia* and *Galli* both in a general and in a restricted sense? Klotz argues, as other critics, including Meusel, have done, that the description of Britain breaks the connexion of the narrative, and that several expressions in the three chapters could not have been used by Caesar. Undoubtedly the description interrupts the story; but so does the digression on the manners and customs of the Gauls and Germans (vi, 11-24), the authenticity of which is indisputable. Klotz concludes that the 'Pseudo-Caesar' used Timagenes as an authority, and that for much of the description the original source was Posidonius. But there is no evidence that Posidonius was ever in Britain (*A. B.*, p. 499, n. 2); and the mention of iron 'currency-bars' (*tales ferreis* [12, § 4]) and of water-clocks (13, § 4) must have come from an eyewitness. If he was not Caesar, the interpolator, when he wrote *Nos nihil . . . videbamus*, was also a liar. Still, I bracket the chapters, because if Meusel and Klotz have not proved that they are spurious, they have given sufficient reasons for suspecting their authenticity. See, however, the first note on 22, § 1.

12, § 2. *iis nominibus . . . pervenerunt*. Only two of the known British tribal names correspond with Belgic tribal names,—namely, those of the Atrebates and the Catuvellauni, neither of whom are mentioned by Caesar. This sentence is an example of the kind of loose construction called Anacoluthon; for *quibus* belongs to a different noun from that which is coupled with its antecedent, *iis*.

§ 3. *aedificia* in Caesar generally means 'homesteads' or 'granaries'.

§ 4. *aere*. The earliest of the British bronze coins that have been found are some years later than the time of Caesar (*A. B.*, p. 294). For this reason most editors, following Mommsen, now delete or bracket *aut aere*; but if ch. 12-14 were interpolated by a late writer, the words may be genuine.

nummo aureo. Numerous British gold coins have been discovered. The earliest were struck about 150 years before Caesar's invasion; and the types were derived mainly from Gallic coins or through Gaul from coins of Philip of Macedon, which had found their way into Gaul through the medium of the Greek merchants of Massilia (Marseilles). Until about 30 B. C. they were uninscribed (*A. B.*, pp. 248-50).

taleis . . . nummo. A large number of these iron bars have been unearthed; and one of the hoards contained 394 specimens. They may be arranged, according to their weight, in four groups, the heaviest being twice as valuable as the next, four times as valuable as the third, and eight times as valuable as the lightest. Not a single bar has come to light in the eastern and south-eastern counties, where coins are most abundant (*A. B.*, pp. 250-1; *P. S. A.*, xxii, 1907-9, pp. 338-43).

§ 5. *in mediterraneis regionibus*. I can only account for this mistake by the following suggestion. According to Strabo (iii, 5, § 11), Publius Crassus—probably the Crassus who was sent by Caesar in 57 B. C. to occupy Brittany (*B. G.*, ii, 34)—sailed to the Cassiterides, or 'tin-islands', and obtained information about the tin-mining. If I am right in identifying the Cassiterides with the British Isles (*A. B.*, pp. 483-98), Crassus sailed from Brittany to Cornwall. He may have contented himself with landing on the coast, where the tin was delivered to the merchants: if so, he was doubtless informed that the tin was actually won in the interior, as, in literal truth, it of course was; and Caesar (or the writer of *B. G.*, v, 12-14) may have concluded from his report that the mines were far from the coast.

ferrum. The iron mines were in the Wealden Forest of Sussex, and were not finally abandoned before the nineteenth century.

aere utuntur importato. This statement is not absolutely false, but it is misleading. Both in the Bronze Age and in the Early Iron Age, which began in Britain about 400 B. C., the Britons did import certain articles of bronze, but most of

their bronze was of course of domestic manufacture (*A. B.*, pp. 144, 237, 246).

fagum. If the writer meant the beech, he made a mistake. Discoveries which have been made in submerged forests and in deposits of the Bronze Age prove that the beech existed here long before the Romans first landed in Britain (*A. B.*, pp. 661-2).

§ 6. *Leporem . . . putant*. In regard to this superstition see *A. B.*, p. 55 and nn. 3-4.

animi here means 'pastime'. A moment's thought will suggest how the word got this meaning. Caesar uses *animi* alone in a similar sense in vii, 77, § 10, but doubtless he added *voluptatisque* from his usual desire to explain one word by another and thus make his meaning unmistakable. As Schneider remarks, *animi* by itself might have been taken to mean *doloris evitandi*.

13, § 1. *quo* refers to *angulus*, not to *Cantium*.

inferior . . . spectat. The writer, like most ancient geographers, thought that Southern Britain was roughly parallel with the coast of Gaul, which, they supposed, extended nearly in a straight line from the Rhine to the Pyrenees. The famous explorer, Pytheas of Massilia (Marseilles), who was contemporary with Alexander the Great, knew better (*A. B.*, pp. 217-21, 352; *C. G.*, p. 466, n. 3).

§ 2. *transmissus* is a genitive depending upon an ablative of quality. After *atque* must be understood *eo quod*.

§ 3. *Mona* is evidently the Isle of Man, not Anglesey, which had the same name.

non nulli . . . noctem. In regard to the origin of this misleading statement see *A. B.*, pp. 225-6. Pytheas of Massilia, who explored Britain about the time of Alexander the Great, appears to have been informed that the northernmost of the British Isles was situated on or near the Arctic Circle.

§ 4. *certis . . . mensuris*. In regard to the 'water-clocks' of the Romans see W. Smith's *Dict. of Greek and Roman Antiquities*, 3rd ed., i, 972-5 (s. v. HOROLOGIUM).

§ 6. *angulus*, if the MSS. are right, means (its) 'corner', i. e. the eastern corner. H. Hartz was perhaps right in proposing *alter* instead of *lateris*.

maxime . . . spectat. The meaning is *si ad aliquam terram spectat, maxime spectat ad Germaniam*. I translate the words by 'looks, if anything, in the direction of Germany'.

§ 7. *miliun* is a genitive of quality. Cf. the familiar line 'Came a nurse of ninety years'.

14, § 2. *Interiores . . . serunt* is inaccurate. Archaeological evidence proves that corn was grown in the interior even in the Bronze Age (*A. B.*, pp. 151-2, 224, 253-4, 260, 267).

pellibusque sunt vestiti. Here again the writer was imperfectly informed. Woollen and linen clothes were worn even in the

Bronze Age; and numerous spindle-whorls have been found in dwelling-places both of that period and of the Early Iron Age (*A. B.*, pp. 160-1, 264).

§§ 4-5. *Uxores . . . deducta est*. This custom, which is called polyandry, certainly did not exist among the Celts—this is one of the reasons which have led some critics to deny that these three chapters were written by Caesar—but it may perhaps have survived among certain primitive communities in remote districts.

15, § 1. The narrative, which was interrupted after ch. 11, is here resumed; and if 12-14 were not written by Caesar, there is of course no interruption. Fighting apparently recommenced when Caesar, returning from the coast after 10 days' absence (11, § 8), was approaching the valley of the Great Stour. The enemy's cavalry and charioteers then commenced a fierce running fight (*in itinere*) with Caesar's Gallic cavalry.

fuertit. If Caesar had written *essent*, he would, so to speak, have been placing the reader at the standpoint of a spectator; whereas the perfect merely states the fact that the Romans had the upper hand without calling upon the reader to form a mental picture of the fight.

§ 4. *primis*. See the note on 28, § 3.

§ 5. *tribunus militum*. Although Caesar, in order to oblige politicians who might be useful to him, occasionally granted sinecure tribuneships to men who had no experience of war (Cicero, *Fam.*, viii, 8, § 1), numerous passages in the *Gallic War* (ii, 26, § 1; iii, 14, §§ 3-4; v, 52, § 4; vi, 39, § 2; vii, 47, § 2; 62, § 6) prove that the duties of tribunes in general were most important (*C. G.*, pp. 565-7).

16, § 1. *Toto . . . pugnae* evidently does not mean 'in all this sort of fighting', for one particular fight is referred to. The words, as Schneider remarks, are equivalent to *in tota hac huiusmodi pugna*; and the best translation that I can think of is 'Throughout the whole of this peculiar combat'.

neque ab signis discedere auderent might be translated by 'and they dared not abandon their regular formation'. The standards played so important a part in action as rallying points for the men that Caesar constantly uses the word *signa* in phrases in which it cannot be translated literally.

§ 3. *Equestris autem . . . inferebat*. Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, p. 47) is, I think, right in bracketing these words; and all commentators have recognized that it is very difficult, if not impossible, to explain them. They cannot refer to a combat between the Roman and the British cavalry, for the British cavalry only acted in support of the charioteers. Therefore, if they were genuine, they could only refer to a combat between the Roman cavalry and the combined British charioteers and cavalry, and the meaning would be either (1) 'On the other hand, the mode in which the British cavalry fought [in co-operation with the

charioteers] exposed the Romans, alike in retreat and in pursuit, to exactly the same danger', or (2) 'In fact the nature of the combat of horse [that is to say, the combat between the Roman cavalry and the combined British charioteers and cavalry] exposed the Romans', &c. But the passage, which is not in the first printed edition of the *Commentaries*, is at least suspicious (*A. B.*, pp. 688-91). The difficulty which Caesar found in dealing with the charioteers was partly due to the fact that his army, like all Roman armies, was weak in cavalry,—and in cavalry of the right kind. If he could have taken to Britain one of those German squadrons with their attendant light infantry which so effectively supported him in the war with Vercingetorix, he would have had less trouble (*A. B.*, pp. 342-3, 354).

§ 4. *stationesque dispositas haberent*. These *stationes* corresponded with what Caesar in ii, 22, § 1 calls *subsidia*, that is to say, 'reserves'. The word sometimes means 'pickets', but not here. *integrique . . . succederent*, as the thoughtful reader will see, completes the sense of *atque alios . . . exciperent*. In English the words would be expressed by a participial clause,—'fresh vigorous men taking the places of those who were tired.'

17, § 2. *ab signis legionibusque*. See the note on 16, § 1 (*neque ab signis discedere audent*) and do not be satisfied with the translation 'from the standards and the legions', which is not only hideous but does not express Caesar's meaning.

§ 4. *sui colligendi*. Notice that although *sui* is plural, the gerundive is singular, because the genitive plural of *se* is identical in form with the genitive singular (*L. C.*, iii, 1968-9). No Italian would have written *sui colligendorum*. Madvig, however (*Lat. Gr.*, §§ 297^b, 417), who denies (§ 85) that the reflexive pronoun has a genitive, takes *sui* as the neuter singular of the possessive (*suus*).

§ 5. *summis* is here equivalent to *universis* or *cunctis*; and the sense is (from that time the enemy never encountered us) 'in a general action'.

18, § 1. *Caesar . . . duxit*. Caesar must have marched either by the trackway on the line of which the Romans afterwards made the road called Watling Street, or along the southern slope of the chalk escarpment and across the Medway at Aylesford or Halling. All the Roman and pre-Roman antiquities that have been discovered in Kent, west of a line drawn from Reculver through Canterbury and Lympne to Romney, have come from sites clustering along these routes (*A. B.*, p. 344).

18, § 1. The name 'Watling Street', applied to the road between Canterbury and London, is a popular misnomer.

quod flumen . . . transiri potest. Although numerous attempts have been made, it is impossible to determine the spot where Caesar crossed the Thames. There are only two places for which a shred of real argument has been adduced,—'Coway Stakes', about a furlong west of Walton Bridge, and Brentford.

'Coway Stakes' is close to Halliford; and Dr. E. Guest pointed out that between Hurleyford (about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles west of Great Marlow) and the sea Halliford is the only place 'bearing a name which indicates a ford over it'. But that name originated after the Anglo-Saxon invasion; and we do not know whether there was a ford near Halliford in the time of Caesar. At Brentford a line of stakes, which Mr. Montagu Sharpe identifies with the *acutis sudibus* of § 3, extended some 30 or 40 years ago for about a mile up the river from a point opposite the mouth of the Brent; and he shows that 'no other ancient stakes have been discovered in the lower river during dredging operations': but of course it cannot be proved that the stakes in question were those which Caesar mentions. Indeed the latter must have been displaced or their points sawn off by the Romans, though the ford may have been staked again by the Britons after Caesar's departure (*A. B.*, pp. 692-8, 742; *A. J.*, 1906, pp. 25-39).

§§ 4-5. *His rebus cognitis . . . mandarent.* This excessively laconic passage seems at first sight hard to explain. What happened was probably this. The cavalry were sent behind cover to swim the river close by, where it was not obstructed by stakes; and at the right moment the infantry plunged into the water and advanced to the attack. Caesar had calculated that the Britons would be distracted by the onset of the cavalry upon their flanks and rear; but the infantry were determined to have the credit for themselves. We may suppose that, while they were removing the stakes or sawing off their points, the slingers and archers (see ii, 7, § 1) were able to harass the enemy. It has been objected that *praemisso* 'must mean that Caesar sent the cavalry across the river, ordering the infantry to follow [immediately behind] them'. But such an operation would have been absolutely impossible: the word *Sed* proves that the infantry in their ardour crossed before the cavalry could charge; and *praemisso* simply means that when Caesar was approaching the river he sent on the cavalry in advance (*A. B.*, pp. 845-6, 698-9).

§ 5. *cum.* See the first note on 8, § 6.

19, § 1. *milibus . . . essedariorum.* Does this mean that Cassivellaunus had 4,000 chariots, or 2,000 charioteers with 2,000 warriors (see iv, 33, §§ 1-2)? I adopt the former explanation; but I am not quite sure (*A. B.*, p. 675).

§ 2. *effuderat.* Caesar almost always uses the indicative with *cum* to express repeated action.

§ 3. *tantum . . . poterant.* *Quantum* is not commensurate with *tantum*, for the actual damage was to be done by the cavalry, and their capacity for doing damage was limited by the capacity of the infantry, which protected them, for marching. The meaning is 'that an amount of damage should be done corresponding with the work which the infantry could

do', &c. This translation will serve:—'to injure the enemy as far as the legionaries' powers of endurance would allow.'

20, § 1. Mandubracius had evidently crossed the Channel with Caesar. I infer from the narrative that the embassy of the Trinovantes was dispatched before Caesar had advanced far into the interior, and doubtless as soon as he had proved his superiority. As the Trinovantes were evidently antagonistic to the Catuvellauni—the tribe over whom Cassivellaunus ruled—we may be sure that if they had been forced to join the league against Caesar, they were half-hearted.

fidem secutus. See the note on 3, § 7.

§ 3. *imperiumque obtineat.* These words are added in order to show that Mandubracius was not only to rule, but to rule with full powers, not as a dependant of Cassivellaunus.

21, § 2. *oppidum Cassivellauni.* See p. 78.

§ 3. *Oppidum . . . munierunt.* Caesar would have modified this description if he had seen the great hill-forts (most of which were erected in the Bronze Age and even earlier) of Wiltshire, Somerset, and Dorset. Nearly all the heights on which these forts were erected are covered with soil so thin that they never could have been thickly wooded, and if trees had encumbered their sides, they would have been cut down; for the object of the engineers was to leave no ground on which an enemy could conceal himself (*A. B.*, pp. 136, 255-7).

22, § 1. *quod esse . . . demonstravimus* refers to 14, § 1, and if ch. 12-14 are spurious, this passage must be also. But the existence of this passage is one of the facts which make me doubt whether, after all, 12-14 are not genuine. For if *quod esse . . . demonstravimus* was interpolated, Caesar said nothing to show where Cantium was.

castra navalia. See 11, §§ 5-7.

§ 2. *Lugotorige.* Lugos was a Celtic deity, whose name appears also in Luguvallum (Carlisle) and Lugudunum (Lyons).

§ 3. *Atrebatem Commium.* Commius, who had considerable influence in Britain, had been appointed king over the Atrebates after the campaign of 57 B. C. and had accompanied Caesar on his first expedition (iv, 21, § 7; 27, § 2; 35, § 1).

§ 4. *propter . . . motus.* The meaning is 'because disturbances were likely to break out', &c.

penderet. The imperfect is permissible because *constituit* is an *historic present*. Even in English some writers, notably Carlyle, in telling a story, use the present tense instead of the past when they feel that it is more vivid. Still, Caesar generally uses the present subjunctive in indirect questions after the historic present (*J. B.*, 1894, p. 354). Mommsen (*H. R.*, v, 66) says 'it is certain that the stipulated tribute was never paid',—a mere assertion which is not only improbable, but is opposed to such evidence as we possess (*A. B.*, p. 356). No doubt payment was stopped after Caesar left Gaul; but Mommsen

did not fully appreciate the hold which he could exert over Cassivellaunus through hostages. Hostages in those days were meant to be used. Besides, when Caesar was disobeyed, he said so frankly (iv, 38, § 4).

§ 5. *interdicit atque imperat* means 'strictly forbids', *imperat* being added to strengthen *interdicit*. Schneider is surely wrong in likening this expression to *praecipit atque interdicit* (58, § 4), for there the troops were ordered to do one thing and forbidden to do another.

23, § 1. *exercitum . . . mare*. Caesar omitted to mention that, escorted probably by a small flying column, he had made an earlier visit to the coast on or before the 1st of September (the 5th of August of the Julian calendar). This is attested by a letter which he wrote on that day to Marcus Cicero (*Q. fr.*, iii, 1, § 25). Perhaps he desired to see for himself that the defences of the naval camp (22, § 1) were secure against any future attack, to reinforce the garrison, and to ascertain what progress had been made in the repair of the fleet (*A. B.*, pp. 348-9, 672, 731-3).

§ 3. *tot navigationibus* is, I believe, ablative absolute. Anyhow its force is concessive.

§§ 3-4. *portaret . . . remitterentur*. The subjunctives are due to Attraction of Mood,—in other words, to the influence of *desideraretur* and *reicerentur* respectively.

24, § 1. *Subductis navibus*. Ships were generally beached for the winter, in order to prevent their timbers from rotting. Can any reader suggest what became of these ships—800 or more—which Caesar, as far as we know, never used again?

concilio. See the note on 2, § 4 (*concilia*).

§ 2. Quintus Cicero was a *legatus*, as we learn from one of his brother's letters (*Fam.*, i, 9, § 21).

in Remis . . . Treverorum. If Caesar's narrative is correct, Labienus was still in the country of the Remi towards the end of 54 B. c.; for Caesar says (53, § 2) that Indutiomarus, who had been on the point of attacking Labienus, returned into the country of the Treveri (*copias omnes in Treveros reducit*). In vi, 5, § 6, however, Caesar says that he sent the baggage of the whole army into the country of the Treveri to Labienus, and in vi, 7, § 1 he says that the Treveri were preparing to attack Labienus and the legion which was wintering in their territory: but he does not say that Labienus had transferred his camp from the country of the Remi to that of the Treveri; and Napoleon III argues that Labienus must have remained throughout the winter in his original camp, because, after the destruction of Sabinus's force (v, 26-37), it would have been very dangerous for him to move. Most probably, then, the camp was really in the country of the Treveri, though it was very near the common frontier of the Remi and the Treveri (*in*

confinio Treverorum); and we may suppose that in vi, 5 and 7 Caesar corrected the mistake which he had made in v, 24 (*C. G.*, pp. 732-4).

§ 3. *M. Crassum*,—a son of the celebrated Roman millionaire, who, with Pompey and Caesar, formed the first triumvirate.

quaestorem. The provincial quaestor, as distinguished from the quaestors who served at Rome, acted as Paymaster-General, managed the details of the commissariat, and was responsible for all financial business. Caesar, however, employed quaestors, like *legati*, as commanders of legions (i, 52, § 1; iv, 22, § 3; v, 25, § 5; 46, § 1; 53, § 6; vi, 6, § 1). In 58 B. C. he had only one quaestor; but in 54 at all events (v, 25, § 5) he had two or more.

§ 4. *Unam legionem . . . misit*. This legion, as we learn from vi, 32, §§ 3-4, encamped at a place called *Atuatuca*, the geographical position of which is discussed on pp. 407-8. The positions of all the other camps have of course been guessed at; but, except that of Trebonius, which was at Samarobriua (*Amiens*) (ch. 46-7; *C. G.*, p. 371, n. 1), not one of them is known.

The mention of the five cohorts which formed part of Sabinus's force has caused some perplexity. We know that Caesar had at least eight legions in 54 B. C.; for when he entered Gaul he had four (i, 7, § 2; 10, § 3); he raised two more in the same year (i, 10, § 3), and two more in the year following (ii, 2, § 1). We may be sure, however, that he had not only eight but nine in 54 B. C.; for *proxime* in § 4 of the chapter which we are reading means *nuper*, as it does in vi, 32, § 5, and therefore the legion *quam proxime trans Padum conscripserat* must have been raised in the winter of 55-54 B. C. But what about the *cohortes V*? They were certainly veterans; for otherwise Caesar, after saying that the legion had been recently raised, would not have omitted to add that the five cohorts were recruits. But if they were veterans, they must have belonged to one or more of the other legions. Now, although we have just seen that Caesar had nine legions in this year, there is reason to believe that they were only equivalent to eight and a half, for Sabinus's newly raised legion and his five cohorts were annihilated in the autumn (v, 37): three new legions were raised in the following year (vi, 1, § 4); and at the end of that year Caesar had ten. General A. von Göler suggested that the five cohorts of Sabinus's brigade belonged to one of the old legions, and that the men who belonged to the remaining five of the same legion were drafted into those legions which had lost most by death or disease. If von Göler is wrong, Sabinus's five cohorts must have been detachments from other legions: in other words, Caesar, although he had nominally ten legions in 53 B. C., only had the equivalent of nine and a half, five of the ten having each only 9 cohorts. It seems to me more probable that von Göler is right (*C. G.*, p. 732, n. 1).

§ 7. *milibus . . . continebantur*. If the reader will ponder these words, he will see that they can only mean that none of the camps was more than 100 miles from any other. If Caesar really wrote *C*, he made a mistake, for it is certain that *Atuatuca*, the camp of Sabinus and *Cotta* (see the note on § 4), was much more than 100 miles from *Samarobriva* (*Amiens*), where one of the legions encamped. See ch. 46-7 and *C. G.*, pp. 371-3.

§ 8. *munitaque hiberna*. Permanent camps, intended to be occupied throughout the winter, were of course fortified more elaborately than the temporary camps which were constructed at the end of each day's march (*C. G.*, pp. 586-7).

25, § 1. *cuius maiores . . . obtinuerant*. Evidently the last of *Tasgetius's* ancestors had either been dethroned or succeeded by an oligarchical government. Such revolutions (see p. xlii) were common in Gaul in the century that preceded the arrival of Caesar.

§ 3. *inimici*. Do not forget the distinction between this word and *hostes*.

palam . . . auctoribus may be translated by 'with the avowed sanction of many of the citizens'.

auctoribus. Remember that *auctor* does not always mean 'author' or 'originator'. Sometimes it is equivalent to *qui probat aliquid*.

26, § 2. *fines* here, as also in 46, § 4 and 54, § 2, evidently means 'frontier'.

Indutiomarus had been obliged a few months before to give Caesar 200 hostages, among whom were all his own kinsmen (4, §§ 1-2); but we may infer from vi, 2, § 1 (*Interfecto Indutiomaro . . . ad eius propinquos a Treveris imperium defertur*) that Caesar, after he returned from Britain, had thought it best to restore them. When one reads v, 22, § 4 one finds it hard to conceive why he did so.

If *nuntiiis*, as Meusel thinks, meant 'messengers', not 'messages', would not *ab* be necessary? Cf. ii, 2, § 1; 14, § 1; vii, 48, § 1.

§ 3. *altera Germanis*. I have no doubt that either these words, which were supplied by R. Sydow, or possibly *altera Gallis*, were written by Caesar. There was no reason why he should emphasize *una* if cavalry were not sent out from any other side. It is remarkable that no further mention is made of the cavalry in the following narrative (32-7).

§ 4. *aliqui*. This is the only passage in Caesar in which *aliqui* is substantival. Cf. Cicero, *Pro Sulla*, 13, § 39.

27, § 1. *eques Romanus*. In Caesar's time the Roman *equites* were the class engaged in business—banking, money-lending, and the like—which senators were forbidden to take part in (though they found ways of evading the law), and comprising all whose property exceeded in value 400,000 sesterces (about

£3,333); but originally the *equites* were the cavalry, who were selected from the wealthiest citizens.

qui . . . consuerat. Evidently Ambiorix had made himself useful to Caesar as a political agent, and the acts of kindness for which he professed gratitude were presumably the reward which he received for his services.

§ 2. *quod* does not mean 'because', but, as in many other passages, serves to explain a preceding word,—here *beneficiis*. A translation will make this clear,—'He would admit that he was deeply indebted to Caesar for various acts of kindness, having by his good offices been relieved of tribute', &c. Where *quod* means simply 'because', as in 24, § 1, the meaning is unmistakable.

ei, as the learner has perhaps noticed, is used instead of *sibi*. Other instances occur in the *Commentaries*; but to lecture Caesar for inaccuracy, as some editors do, is foolish. It would be wiser to observe how he used the language of which he was a master and to modify grammatical rules.

§ 3. *fecerit*. The primary tense, following four secondary tenses—*liberatus esset*, &c.—is remarkable; but in relative clauses of this kind Caesar often uses the perfect subjunctive even when secondary tenses of the subjunctive precede and follow (*J. B.*, 1894, pp. 362–3). See the note on § 4 (*potuerit*).

suaque . . . multitudinem. It has often been said that these words are inconsistent with what Caesar says in vi, 13, § 1,—that 'the masses are regarded almost as slaves, never venture to act on their own initiative', &c. Perhaps they are: but if so, the case of Ambiorix was the exception that proves the rule; and I am not quite sure that *multitudo* here means the whole 'multitude' of Ambiorix's host. Perhaps it only means the 'knights' or influential landowners (vi, 13, § 3) and their retainers; for in vii, 63, § 6 *multitudinis* can only bear this meaning. In viii, 8, § 3 (*consilio advocato . . . animos multitudinis confirmat*) *multitudo* plainly denotes only the officers who were present at a council of war; while any one who compares viii, 7, § 4 with 22, § 2 will see reason to doubt whether, if *multitudinem* does mean 'the multitude', Ambiorix told the truth (*C. G.*, pp. 529–41, and especially pp. 532–3, 536–7).

§ 4. *potuerit*, says Meusel (*J. B.*, 1894, pp. 364–5), is very surprising, for it follows five secondary tenses of the subjunctive (*liberatus esset*, &c.), and immediately follows a perfect infinitive,—*fuisse*. 'I can only suppose', he says, 'that *quod*-clauses of this kind, which do not depend upon the principal sentence, could be treated like independent relative clauses in *Oratio Obliqua*,' in which, as in § 3, Caesar frequently uses the perfect subjunctive even when secondary tenses of the subjunctive precede and follow. I confess that I see nothing surprising in *potuerit*. Meusel apparently forgets that it is preceded by *fecerit* (§ 3); and I have no doubt that in both cases Caesar

used the primary tense because Ambiorix was describing what had only just happened, whereas in § 2 he described what had happened some time before. Cf. ii, 4, §§ 2, 4.

sit . . . confidat. The present was used because the subjunctives were preceded by a present infinitive, *posse*; and the primary tenses in §§ 7-11 are to be accounted for on the same principle.

§ 6. *videretur.* It is perhaps needless to point out that the literal meaning of *videretur* is 'was seen', not 'seemed'. *Praesertim . . . videretur* may be translated by 'especially as the object of the movement was, of course, to recover national liberty'.

§ 7. Beware of translating *pietate* by 'piety'.

hospitio. See the note on 6, § 2 (*hospitibus*).

§ 9. *Ipsorum esse consilium,*—'It was for them [the Roman generals] to decide'.

28, § 3. *primorum ordinum centuriones.* Who were the 'centurions of the first rank'? No less than eight theories have been devised about them; but it is, I believe, now generally admitted that they were the six centurions of the 1st cohort in each legion. For the ten cohorts in each legion were numbered; the 1st ranked above the rest (15, § 4); and it may therefore be presumed that all took rank according to their numbers. That this was the case under the Empire is certain; for the 10th cohort was the lowest. Moreover, a centurion was promoted in the civil war 'from the 8th class to the rank of *primipilus*', or chief centurion of the legion; and Modestus, a centurion who had served for eighteen years in four grades of rank, held the position of *hastatus posterior* in the 3rd cohort, which accords with the supposition that the 3rd cohort ranked below the first two, but above all the rest. A passage in Tacitus (*Hist.*, iii, 22) shows that in the time of the Emperor Galba there were not less than six *primorum ordinum centuriones* in the 7th legion. Lastly, it is proved by inscriptions that the centurions of the 1st cohort known as *primus pilus prior*, *primus princeps prior*, and *primus hastatus prior* were the first three centurions of the legion; and the natural conclusion is that the 4th, 5th, and 6th centurions of the 1st cohort also ranked above all the centurions of the other cohorts (*C. G.*, pp. 567-79).

§ 4. *rem . . . quod.* Meusel takes this to mean 'the fact that'. May it not mean 'The facts of the case (proved this), because'? I translate the words by 'Experience proved this; for', &c.

sustinuerint. See the first note on 27, § 4.

§ 6. *esset* is the reading of α ; β has *esse*. This is a rhetorical question: therefore the infinitive answers to one of the rules which grammarians have framed for *Oratio Obligua*. But the rule does not derive much support from the MSS. of the *Commentaries*. The subjunctive is found in rhetorical questions in all the MSS. in i, 40, § 2; 43, § 8; v, 29, §§ 5-7; and *B. C.*, i, 32,

§ 3; and in the first and last of these passages the indicative would certainly have been used in Oratio Recta.

29, § 2. *Caesarem arbitrari*. Ciacconius may have been right in supposing that Caesar wrote *Caesarem se arbitrari*; but there is a similar omission of the reflexive pronoun in 36, § 2 and in ii, 4, § 10.

adesset. In English one would say '(if Caesar) had been at hand', and a beginner would probably wonder why he did not write *adfuisset*. But in Oratio Recta Sabinus would have said (neque, si ille) *adesset* (tanta contemptione nostri ad castra) *venissent*, and if in Oratio Obliqua *adesset* had been changed into *adfuisset*, the meaning would have been 'if Caesar had been at hand during the attack and had afterwards departed'.

§ 3. *Sese . . . spectare*,—'It was not to the enemy that he looked for guidance, but to facts'.

Ariovisti mortem. See p. 4. How and in what circumstances Ariovistus was slain is not known; but the remark which Caesar ascribes to Sabinus points to the conclusion that he was killed by Roman hands. It has been suggested that he may have died from a wound received in the battle which is described in i, 52.

§ 5. *persuaderet*. See the note on 28, § 6.

§ 6. The omission of *se* before *perventuros* is harsh: perhaps Meusel is right in conjecturing that Caesar wrote *omnes*.

§ 7. *haberet*. See the note on 28, § 6.

30, § 1. *primisque ordinibus*. The word *ordo*, which in 28, § 3 means *centuria*, is here used (by the figure which grammarians call metonymy) in the sense of *centurio*,—that is to say, *primis ordinibus* is equivalent to *primorum ordinum centurionibus*. Similarly in English one of the musicians in an orchestra is called 'the first violin'. In vii, 62, § 4 *primi ordines* is used in a totally different sense.

§ 3. The learner should ask himself why Caesar wrote *liceat* and *sustineant* instead of *liceret* and *sustinerent*. If he does not know, he can find out with a little trouble.

31, § 3. *permotus* is equivalent to *graviter animo commotus*.

§ 4. *circumspiceret*. See the first sentence of the note on 22, § 4 (*penderet*). In the next sentence an historic present is followed by a present subjunctive; but the reader will see that an imperfect would there be impossible.

§ 5. *Omnia excogitantur . . . augeatur*. It has been argued that this passage is out of place and originally stood in § 3 after *perducitur*; while Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, pp. 46-7), following Mommsen, who says (*ib.*, 1894, p. 207) that, in its existing context, it must mean 'Everything is done in order to make the march as dangerous as possible and to tire out the soldiers beforehand' (!), and who regards it as a 'scathing rebuke' of Sabinus, condemns it altogether as an interpolation. I do not agree with either of these views, and I subjoin my own

translation of §§ 4-5, to show how naturally the passage reads as it stands:—'An order was issued that the troops were to march at daybreak. The men stayed up for the rest of the night, every one looking about to see what he could take with him, what part of his winter's kit he would be forced to leave behind. Men thought of every argument to persuade themselves that they could not remain without danger, and that the danger would be increased by protracted watches and consequent exhaustion,' &c. (*C. G.*, pp. 726-7).

§ 6. *esset*. The subjunctive is causal.

33, § 1. *providisset*. In English the force of the subjunctive can be suggested:—'And now Titurius, having exercised no forethought, lost all nerve,' &c.

haec . . . ut. I need not tell the reader what words must be mentally supplied immediately after *ipsa* and immediately before *ut*.

viderentur. See the note on 27, § 6.

§ 2. *auctor*. See the note on 25, § 3 (*auctoribus*).

§ 3. *in orbem consistere*. *Orbis* here is a technical military term. Obviously it does not denote a perfect circle; and a friend of mine, a very able officer of the Royal Artillery, suggests that it means an irregular figure, approximating more or less closely to a circle or oval; for, as he points out, to dress the line properly, with the enemy pressing on to attack, would have been impossible (*C. G.*, p. 728).

§ 6. *haberet*. The subjunctive is due to Attraction of Mood.

34, § 1. *barbaris* should not be translated by 'barbarians'. The word 'natives', which, as used by Englishmen in speaking, say, of natives of India, often implies some contempt, will do better.

§ 2. *Erant . . . pares*. These words are untranslatable. Two inferior MSS. have *pugnando*; and if this reading were adopted, the literal translation of *Erant . . . nostri* would be, 'Our men were equally matched [with the enemy] in fighting, both in respect of courage and numbers,' or, in idiomatic English, 'Our men were as brave as they and not overmatched in point of numbers.' H. J. Heller conjectures that Caesar wrote (*et virtute et studio* (*pugnandi*)); but Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, p. 57) brackets *Erant . . . pares*, because (1), as the narrative shows, the Romans were outnumbered by the Eburones; (2) if the subject of *erant* is *nostri*, Caesar, as we may infer from iii, 14, § 8, would certainly have said that in valour the Romans were *superiores*; and (3) if the subject is *Eburones* or *utrique* understood, he would never have admitted that the Eburones were as brave as the Romans. The first of these reasons seems to me the best.

§ 4. *ad signa recipientes*. See the second note on 16, § 1.

35, § 2. *eam partem*,—i. e. *cohortem*.

ab latere aperto means 'on the right flank', which was exposed

(*apertum*) because the shield was worn on the left arm. This was denied by Stoffel, who maintained that the words simply meant 'on the exposed flank',—left or right, as the case might be; but besides this passage there are at least two others in Caesar—iv, 26, § 3 and vii, 82, § 2—which prove that *ab latere aperto* is a technical military phrase and means what I have said. For the troops which are mentioned in each of these three passages were exposed, as far as their *position* was concerned, on their left as well as on their right; and therefore either *ab latere aperto* signified 'on the right and unshielded flank' or it signified nothing. See *C. G.*, pp. 621–3, the arguments in which have been accepted on the Continent as conclusive.

§ 3. *coeperant*. See the note on 19, § 2.

§ 4. *vellent*. The subjunctive leaves it uncertain whether the soldiers did or did not intend to hold their ground; and it is necessarily followed by an indicative (*relinquebatur*): for if Caesar had written *relictus esset*, he would have meant that they had had no such intention. See *J. B.*, 1894, p. 374.

§ 5. *ad horam octavam*. The Romans divided the period between sunrise and sunset into 12 hours, which of course were only equal in length to our hours at the equinox.

pugnaretur. Meusel (*J. B.*, 1894, pp. 389–90) remarks that in expressions of this kind (iii, 5, § 1; vii, 80, § 6) Caesar generally uses the imperfect where one would have expected the pluperfect. I do not think that I would have expected it: the imperfect pictures the long-drawn-out battle more vividly. When Caesar does use the pluperfect, as in i, 26, § 4, he wishes to show that the fighting was over.

§ 6. *qui superiore . . . duxerat* is equivalent to *qui primipilus fuerat*, for *pilum*, which, remember, comes from *pilus*, not *pilum*, means the same as *triariorum manipulum*: in other words, Balventius had in the previous year been the chief centurion of his legion. But why was he not still? Probably he had served his full time and was now serving again as an *evocatus*, or volunteer; for it is evident from the way in which Caesar speaks of him that he had not been degraded (*C. G.*, pp. 577–8).

§ 7. *eiusdem ordinis*. *Ordo* is here used in the sense of 'rank', 'grade', or 'position'. See the note on 30, § 1. There is nothing to show whether Lucanius belonged to the same cohort to which Balventius had belonged or to the 1st cohort of some other legion. In the latter case the cohort must have been one of the five which are mentioned in 24, § 4.

§ 8. *ordines* of course here means 'centuries'. See the note on 30, § 1.

in adversum os. The adjective shows that the stone flew not obliquely, but from the front and struck Cotta full in the face. The preposition is used as if Caesar had written (*lapide qui funda*) *in adversum os* (*missus erat*).

36, § 1. *Cn. Pompeium*. The interpreter was doubtless a Gaul

belonging to the Roman Province, who had taken the name of his Roman patron.

§ 2. *sperure*. I doubt whether it is necessary to follow Meusel's example and add *se*, which is not in the MSS. See the first note on 29, § 2.

37, § 1. Kraner takes (in) *praesentia* as accusative plural,— 'with a view to existing circumstances'. I have little doubt that Meusel is right in regarding it as ablative singular. There is a certain instance of the noun *praesentia* in 43, § 4.

§ 3. *ordines* here apparently means 'ranks'.

§ 6. *se ipsi interficiunt* is generally taken to mean, not that each individual committed suicide, but that the men killed one another. The Latin might of course bear either meaning; but the latter is suggested by Livy, *Epit.*, 110 (*auxiliares . . . inter se concurrentes occubuerunt*), and Lucan, iv, 556–66.

38, § 2. *sui . . . liberandi*. See the note on 17, § 4.

39, § 2. *qui . . . discessissent*. I am inclined to think that here, as in 33, §§ 1–2, the subjunctive is causal, Caesar accounting for the capture of the soldiers by their having gone to fetch wood; but Meusel (*L. C.*, iii, 1507) regards it as due to Attraction of Mood. See the note on 33, § 6.

lignationis is explained by *munitionisque*. The wood was required, at all events in part, for the purpose of fortification. Cf. 40, § 2.

§ 3. *Eburones . . . clientes*. Grammatically the Eburones, Nervii, and Atuatici are to be regarded as one group and their allies and dependents as another: otherwise, as the learner will see if he remembers how copulative conjunctions are used in Latin, *atque* would be incorrect.

clientes here means dependent tribes. A state which had 'clients' exercised over them whatever power it could; and some clients were less dependent upon the same state than others. Thus the Ceutrones, &c., were under the *imperium* of the Nervii, and therefore had to render military service when required to do so, and probably also to pay tribute, as the Eburones did to the Atuatici (v, 27, § 2); but the Carnutes, although they were clients of the Remi, were evidently not under their *imperium*, for they rebelled against Caesar when the Remi remained loyal (vi, 4, § 5). Client tribes certainly managed their own internal affairs, and, as we learn from vi, 12, §§ 6–8, occasionally transferred their allegiance from one powerful state to another (*C. G.*, pp. 517–19).

40, § 1: *ad Caesarem*. Caesar was at Samarobriua (Amiens). Cf. 46, 47, §§ 1–2.

§ 2. *turres admodum CXX*. If we suppose that the towers were only 80 feet apart, as they are said to have been at Alesia (vii, 72, § 4), the perimeter of the camp, without reckoning the space occupied by the towers themselves, would have been 119 × 80, or 9,480 feet; and allowing for that space, it could

not have been less than two miles. The camp then would have covered an area of 160 acres—one-fourth of a square mile—which is very much too large for a single legion. See, however, the note on § 6 (*contabulantur*). Caesar's narrative was of course based upon the report of Cicero; but I suspect that the exaggeration, if there is one, is due to a copyist, for to falsify the number of the towers would hardly have increased the glory of the defence (*C. G.*, pp. 250-1). *Turres*,—wooden towers, from the stories of which archers, slingers, and artillery showered missiles among the defenders of a besieged town, or, as in this case, among the assailants of a camp. When they were mounted upon an *agger*, or siege terrace (cf. ii, 30, §§ 3-4), they were moved on rollers. Occasionally they were very high, containing as many as ten stories (viii, 41, § 5).

§ 5. *ad laborem intermittitur*. See the note on 11, § 6.

§ 6. *muralium pilorum*,—heavy pikes, hurled from walls or towers. Cf. vii, 82, § 1.

contabulantur is equivalent to *tabulatis instruuntur*,—'furnished with stories'. M. Camille Jullian believes that the towers were connected by platforms (see viii, 9, § 3 and the note on vii, 22, § 3); and if so, the number (*CXX*) may be true. But this conjecture is not supported by the word *contabulantur*: in Livy, xxiv, 34, § 7 (*turres contabulatas*) can only mean 'furnished with stories', and the platforms that occasionally connected military towers were called *pontes*.

pinnae loricaeque. As a *pinna* is a pinnacle, and a *lorica* (which properly means a coat of mail or a breastplate) is here a breastwork, *pinnae . . . cratibus* may be translated by 'embattled breastworks of wattle-work'. They were fastened (*atexuntur*) to the towers, and served to screen the artillerymen who worked the catapults on the successive stories.

§ 7. *ultra*. Dictionaries explain the meaning which is at the root of this word, but otherwise give hardly enough help to the beginner. When *ultra* is equivalent to *sua sponte* its meaning is unmistakable; but here it means something different, implying that the soldiers, in their anxiety to spare Cicero fatigue, went beyond—overstepped—the line which ordinarily kept them at a respectful distance from their commander. I translate it here by 'actually'. The reader has doubtless seen for himself that in 28, § 4 it means 'into the bargain'.

41, § 1. *principes* may here be translated by 'chieftains'. See the note on 3, § 2.

§ 6. *incolumibus* is here attracted into the case of *illis*. In vi, 35, § 8 *licet* is followed by an accusative, which is less usual.

42, § 1. *vallo pedum X*. When Caesar mentions the height of a *vallum* he means the combined height of the rampart and the palisade which surmounted it. See *B. C.*, iii, 63, § 1.

pedum XV denotes the breadth of the ditch, which was

doubtless V-shaped. Caesar once (vii, 72, § 1) mentions a trench which, as only a small force was available for its defence, he constructed with vertical sides; but the labour of digging such trenches was of course very great.

§ 3. *essent*. The subjunctive shows that *ferramentorum* . . . *essent* is equivalent to *eiusmodi ferramentorum ut essent*.

§ 5. *ad* here, as in iv, 17, § 3, means 'in proportion to', not 'up to', for the towers would have been useless unless they had been higher than the rampart.

falces were used for loosening and dragging down the material of a rampart (vii, 84, § 1) or the stones and timbers in the walls of a besieged town (vii, 22, § 2), and were worked by men who were safe inside a sappers' hut. Vegetius (*De re mil.*, iv, 14) describes the *falx* as a wooden beam with a piece of iron at the end, wrought into the shape of a hook. A specimen was discovered about 50 years ago in the Gallic wall of Vesontio (Besançon). See *C. G.*, p. 611.

testudines were sappers' huts, used for protecting soldiers when they were filling up ditches, undermining walls, &c. They had sloping roofs, so that stones dropped on to them by the enemy might slide off harmlessly, and they were protected against fire, probably by raw hides soaked in water. Minute descriptions of these huts, derived from various writers, Greek and Roman, are to be found in dictionaries of antiquities; but I do not advise the reader to consult them; for it is not likely that the *testudines* which the Nervii made resembled those of the Greeks, though they may have been constructed on the same general principles. A *testudo*, used by Caesar's lieutenant, Trebonius, to protect his men in levelling the ground for the construction of an *agger*, is described in *B. C.*, ii, 2, § 4; and its dimensions differed widely from those of *testudines* in general, as given by Vitruvius, x, 14 (*C. G.*, pp. 609-10).

43, § 1. *fusili* . . . *glandes*. The ordinary meaning of *fusilis* is 'molten'; but clay cannot be melted. *Fusili ex argilla* must therefore mean 'of softened (or plastic) clay'. General A. von Göler proved by experiment that balls of clay can be sufficiently heated to set straw on fire; and innumerable bullets of baked clay have been found in ancient British forts. Why were the slings not destroyed by these red-hot bullets? I suppose that they were lined with metal (*C. G.*, pp. 729-30).

casas . . . *tectae*. I am inclined to infer from a parallel passage (16, § 2) in the anonymous *Bellum Hispaniense*; which describes Caesar's last campaign, that these huts had been built by Cicero's troops.

§ 4. *demigrandi causa*. Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, p. 50) deletes these words as either a foolish marginal note or a corruption. Kraner defends them on the ground that men might have left the rampart for good reasons with the intention of returning

(cf. 51, § 5); but Meusel denies that Caesar would have expressed 'with the intention of quitting his post' in this way.

§ 5. *ut* (following *interficeretur*) includes the senses of *quandoquidem*, 'inasmuch as' and *quem ad modum*: as Meusel says (*L. C.*, iii, 2390), '*et modum et causam significat*'.

que . . . non. Doubtless Caesar wrote this instead of *neque* in order to emphasize the negation. *Non dabant* is virtually one word; therefore *que . . . non* is not incorrect.

44, § 1. *adpropinquarent*. To bring out the consecutive force of the subjunctive in English is not easy. Here is my attempt:—'In this legion there were two centurions . . . who, by dint of extraordinary courage, were getting close,' &c. Do not accept this translation unless you are satisfied that it completely and exactly expresses the Latin.

§ 5. *Ne . . . quidem* evidently does not mean 'Not even', but 'of course . . . not'. One might translate by 'Vorenus of course did not keep inside the rampart'.

§ 6. *quo . . . hunc*. The reader might have expected *quem percussum et exanimatum*; but, as Schneider says (vol. i, p. 255), Caesar chose the other way of expressing himself because he wished to emphasize the fact that the Gaul in question was struck. He often used this construction.

progrediendi, the reading of β , is preferable to *regrediendi*, as one may infer from § 8.

§ 10. *illum . . . arbitrantur*. I follow Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, pp. 52-3) in bracketing these words. The reading of α —*illum vero obscurantur occisum*—which is nonsensical, suggests that there is something wrong. 'The fanciful reader', says Meusel, 'wanted to explain the fact, which seemed to him surprising, that the entire hostile group [*omnis multitudo*] turned upon Vorenus.' The preceding narrative shows that there was not the slightest reason to suppose that Pullo was dead.

§ 14. *versavit*. How is one to express the meaning—'moved [them] about'—in English? I should say ('Thus Fortune) made them her puppets', &c.

45, § 2. *a prima obsidione* means 'immediately after the beginning of the blockade'. Cf. *L. C.*, i, 41.

§ 3. *magnis praemiis*, says J. Lange (*N. J.*, clv, 1897, p. 613), means 'by the promise of large rewards', for of course the slave was not paid in advance. He may, indeed, have demanded a sum down before he started, for in iii, 18, § 2 and 26, § 1 *praemiis pollicitationibusque* must surely mean 'rewards and promises' (of further reward): but Lange's view is supported by 55, § 3 and i, 44, § 2, where Ariovistus says that he *non sine magna spe magnisque praemiis donum . . . reliquisse*; and I believe that he is right.

§ 4. *in iaculo* is the reading of α : β omits *in*. Supposing that *in* is right, it must mean 'on': for if, as Long suggests

(*D. R. R.*, iv, 227), the letter was inserted *in* the hollowed shaft of a javelin, lashing (*inligatas*) was obviously both superfluous and impossible. The letter could easily have been concealed by lashing twine over it, as if the javelin had been spliced.

46, § 2. *cum nuntio* does not mean 'along with the messenger' (that, if it were true, would be a superfluous piece of information), but 'on the arrival of the messenger'.

§ 4. *commodo* is ablative.

CCCC. This was a very small number (cf. 8, §§ 1-2). We may infer from the present passage, as well as from the passages (iv, 6, § 5; vi, 4, § 6) which show that Caesar regularly levied contingents of cavalry from the various Gallic tribes in the spring, that the Gallic cavalry, or the bulk of them, were sent home for the winter, while the Spanish cavalry and the German remained with the legions.

47, § 1. *adventu* here, as often, means not 'arrival' but 'approach'.

§ 2. *impedimenta*. The troops who had been quartered at Atuatuca, and doubtless also the legions in the other camps, had heavy baggage with them (31, § 6). In the campaign of 52 B. C. Caesar left the baggage of the whole army at Agedincum (Sens) (vii, 10, § 3); but, as any soldier would understand, the army nevertheless took some baggage with it into the field (35, § 3).

§ 4. *sciret*. The subjunctive is causal.

48, § 1. *etsi . . . redierat*. Though the meaning of these words is unmistakable, it is hard to translate them into good English. I should say 'although he had only two legions instead of the three which he had expected'.

§ 3. *equitibus Gallis*. The adjective of *Gallus* is *Gallicus*, but Caesar never uses it as an epithet of living beings. The phrase *equites Galli* is like *mare Oceanus*.

§ 4. *Graecis conscriptam litteris* can only mean 'written in Greek characters'. Dion Cassius (xl, 9, § 3) says that the letter was written in Greek: but his testimony on such a point proves nothing; and if Caesar had meant what Dion supposed, he would have said *Graece*. He uses the expression *Graecis litteris* in two other passages (i, 29, § 1 and vi, 14, § 3), where the meaning 'Greek characters' is indisputable. He wrote the letter in Latin but in Greek characters, just as officers in the Indian Mutiny sometimes wrote dispatches in Greek characters. This passage proves that some of the Nervii or their allies understood Latin (*C. G.*, pp. 730-1).

§ 5. An *ammentum* was a thong, fastened to the middle of a javelin, to enable it to be thrown with greater force. As Long explains (*D. R. R.*, iv, 228), referring to Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, xii, 321 (*inserit amento digitos*), 'when a man wished to throw a spear, he grasped the shaft . . . inserted his fingers in the loop and by means of the additional leverage was able to throw a

heavy weapon a considerable distance'. Mr. R. R. Marett (*Anthropology*, 1912, p. 231) says that the Australian 'spear-thrower' 'for no obvious reason enables him [an Australian native] to throw his spear extraordinarily far. I have myself', he adds, 'seen an Australian spear, with the help of the spear-thrower, fly a hundred and fifty yards, and strike true and deep at the end of its flight.'

§ 10. *fumi incendiorum*. Caesar was burning villages as he advanced, just as the English did in the Indian Mutiny. Cf. viii, 3, § 2.

49, § 1. *milia LX*. Probably this number was exaggerated. It is often impossible to get accurate estimates of an enemy's force. Colonel G. F. R. Henderson (*Stonewall Jackson*, i, 1898, p. 158) says that in the American Civil War 'Patterson reported to his Government that he had been opposed by 3,500 men, exactly ten times Jackson's actual number' (*C. G.*, p. 242).

§ 3. *Hunc*. I used to think, as Meusel apparently does (*L. C.*, i, 144), that the pronoun referred to *Gallum*; but I am now inclined to believe that Long (*D. R. R.*, iv, 229) is right in identifying it with *Caesarem*.

§ 6. *considit*. Just as one can sometimes best render the force of a Latin word by omitting to translate it, so it is sometimes necessary to introduce an English word the equivalent of which is left by a Latin writer to the imagination. To connect the clause that begins with *considit* with what precedes, the word 'Accordingly' is required.

§ 7. *viarum*. Passages crossed a Roman camp from front to rear and from side to side. Of the latter the principal (*via principalis*) connected the *porta principalis dextra* with the *porta principalis sinistra*. From the centre of the *via principalis* to the *porta praetoria*—the front gate of the camp—extended the *via praetoria*. Just inside the rampart a passage, in which the army was formed up when it was about to march out, ran right round the camp.

§ 8. *speculatoribus*. *Speculatores* (scouts) were not the same as *exploratores* (patrols), who were generally cavalry. *Speculatores* were often employed singly; and under the Empire there were ten in each legion. Similarly in our own army there are trained scouts in each company of infantry (*Tr.*, p. 58, n. 1).

50, § 5. *consulto*. Doberenz-Dinter, referring to 16, § 2, take this word with *cedere*: to me it is self-evident that it goes with *Caesar . . . iubet*.

portas. The gates (so-called) were openings in the rampart.

51, § 4. *videbantur* is equivalent to *sibi videbantur*.

52, § 1. *etiam* is to be taken, in the sense of *vel*, with *parvulo*.

§ 6. *hoc* is ablative.

53, § 1. *per Remos*. Doberenz-Dinter take these words in the sense of *per Remorum fines*. I believe that they are equivalent to a *Remis* or *Remorum opera*; and I find that Schneider, who refers to iv, 21, § 5, and Meusel (*L. C.*, ii, 1044) take them in the same way. The instances in which *per* is used in the sense

of *auxilio* or *opera* fill nearly three columns of Meusel's Lexicon. If Caesar had meant 'through the country of the Remi', he would almost certainly have written *per Remorum fines* (see *L. C.*, ii, 1040-1, i, 1270). He only twice (i, 6, § 1; 9, § 1) uses *per* with the name of a tribe in the sense of 'through the country of', and there his meaning is unmistakable.

fieret. Meusel (*L. C.*, iii, 1505) regards the force of the subjunctive as final. I should say that it is consecutive,—'a shout arose . . . announcing a victory and conveying the congratulations of the Remi.'

§ 3. *trinis*. It ought to be unnecessary to explain why *trinis* is used, and not *tribus*.

totam hiemem . . . decrevit. See the second note on 1, § 1.

§ 4. *reliqui* cannot be genitive, as any one will see if he reads the sentence carefully. It means 'the other tribes' from the point of view of each tribe which sent embassies.

§ 6. *Aremoricae* is a Celtic word meaning 'maritime'.

54, § 1. *cum se scire . . . denuntiaret* is an old conjecture, which appeared first in the Aldine edition. The reading of *a* is *cum se scire quae fierent alias cohortando denuntiaret*, the order of which is obviously wrong; of *β*, *cum sciret deficere, alias cohortando*, which is nonsense. Meusel (*J. B.*, 1910, p. 38) brackets the words in question as a marginal explanation of *territando*.

§ 4. *fuert*. See the note on 15, § 1 (*fuert*).

§ 5. *compluribus . . . causis*. Cf. 41, § 5 and *C. G.*, pp. 103-5. *eius*, I am sure, agrees with *opinionis*, and Meusel (*L. C.*, ii, 257) agrees with me.

55, § 2. *Ariovisti . . . Tencterorum*. See pp. 4, 7.

56, § 2. *qui ex iis . . . necatur*. Probably the last comer was regarded as accursed. That his execution involved a religious ceremony I have little doubt; and I am sure that those who have studied Celtic religion will agree with me. Cf. vi, 16.

venit is of course perfect: tenses in Latin, as the learner doubtless knows, correspond with facts, for good Latin writers said exactly what they meant; whereas in English tenses are often used loosely.

§ 3. *quem supra demonstravimus . . . discessisse*. Cf. 3, §§ 2-5; 4, § 3.

57, § 2. *equites . . . evocat*. As it was winter, Labienus had only a few cavalry with him. See the second note on 46, § 4.

58, § 1. *intromissis equitibus*. Evidently the Treveran sentries were excessively careless.

§ 4. *praecipit atque interdicat*. The former verb of course refers to *unum . . . Indutiomarum*, the latter to *neu quis . . . viderit*; but, as in 22, § 5, it is impossible to use two verbs in translation: 'giving stringent orders' will bring out the sense.

§ 6. *hominis*. See the note on 7, § 9. I doubt whether our language can adequately express the compliment which the word implies (though Schneider may be right in thinking that it is used with a touch of irony). If Caesar had written in English, he might perhaps have said, 'the general's' (good fortune), suggesting that Labienus was a good general.